

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 1-24 are amended by the present amendment. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, the specification was objected to; Claims 1-2, 4-8, 11, 14, 19-20, and 23 were objected to; the drawings were objected to; Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 11 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101; Claims 1, 10-12, and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Publication 2002/0087892 to Imazu; Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Imazu; Claims 2-8 and 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Imazu in further view of U.S. Publication 2004/0068524 to Aboulhosn; Claims 9 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Imazu in view of Aboulhosn and further in view of U.S. Publication 2002/0184515 to Oho et al. (herein “Oho”); and Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Imazu in view of Aboulhosn and further in view of U.S. Publication 2002/0095571 to Bradee and U.S. Publication 2002/0191964 to Satyavolu et al. (herein “Satyavolu”).

Regarding the objection to the specification, the specification has been amended as suggested in the Office Action. Thus, it is respectfully requested the objection to the specification be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding the objection to Claims 1-2, 4-8, 11, 14, 19-20, and 23, the Claims have been amended to correct the informalities pointed out in the Office Action. Thus, it is respectfully requested the objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding the objection to the drawings, the specification has been amended to include reference to the reference characters 74 and SP1000 to place the drawings in

compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5). Thus, it is respectfully requested the objection to the drawings be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Claim 12 is amended to remove the phrase identified in the Office Action. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the objection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 11 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, Claim 11 and 24 are amended to recite, “a computer storage readable medium,” as suggested in the Office Action. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In addition, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1, 10-12, and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Imazu, with respect to amended independent Claims 1, 10-12, and 23-24.

Claim 1 recites “registration information including a first user identification information for use in utilizing a service in a service utilizing apparatus, a first password corresponding to the first user identification information, and a first apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus.” Claims 10-12, 23 and 24 recite similar subject matter. It is respectfully submitted that these features are neither disclosed by nor rendered obvious by Imazu, Aboulhosn, Oho, Bradee, Satyavolu or any conceivable combination thereof.

The Office Action asserts that Imazu discloses “user identification information (i.e., login identifier) for use in utilizing a service in the service utilizing apparatus, a password corresponding to the user identification information, and an apparatus name (i.e., registration identifier) of the service utilizing apparatus... (0014, lines 3-9, 11-13).” Applicants respectfully disagree.

Imazu describes an “[a]uthentication method... that forwards to a communication device of a user a registration identifier that identifies the user and/or the communication device by including the identifier in an address of registration screen peculiar to the user and/or the communication device... and a first password is entered and replied to the registration screen, authenticates the user based on the registration identifier and the first password.”<sup>1</sup> In Imazu, “registration screen 221a comprises fields for registration identifier 222, registration password 223, send button 224 and effective period 225.”<sup>2</sup> Imazu adds “[f]ield 222 is an ID that identifies the user and/or the communication device registered in user management table 210.”<sup>3</sup> Therefore, Imazu makes clear that a single field 222 contains a single identifier that serves to identify both the user and the communication device. In other words, Imazu does not describe registration information including a first user identification information for use in utilizing a service in a service utilizing apparatus and a first apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus as recited in Claims 1, 10-12, 23 and 24. That is, Imazu does not describe a separate identifier for the user and a separate identifier for the communication device. Therefor, Imazu fails to describe the features of Claims 1, 10-12, 23 and 24 quoted above.

Neither Aboulhosn, Oho, Bradee, or Satyavolu corrects the deficiencies of Imazu pointed out above. Neither of these references describes registration information including a first user identification information for use in utilizing a service in a service utilizing apparatus, a first password corresponding to the first user identification information, and a first apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus as recited in Claims 1, 10-12, 23 and 24.

It is respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 2-9 and 13-22 are patentable at least for the reasons argued above with regard to the claims from which they depend.

---

<sup>1</sup> Abstract. See paragraph [0014].

<sup>2</sup> FIG. 2a and paragraph [0060].

<sup>3</sup> Paragraph [0060].

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of Claims 1-24 be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that Claims 1-24 be found allowable.

Consequently, for the reasons discussed in detail above no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.


Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Michael L. Gellner". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line underneath the name.

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Michael L. Gellner  
Registration No. 27,256